ISSN 0041-7904

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INFORMATION BULLETIN

Vol. 41, No. 4

January 22, 1982

OPM Proposes Revised Standards For Librarians, Related Positions

The Library recently received from the Federal Office of Personnel Management (OPM) its proposed revisions of qualification requirements and position classification standards for positions currently classified in the GS–1410 *Librarian Series,* the GS–1412 *Technical Information Specialist Series,* and the GS–1411 *Library Technician Series.* The proposal includes a significant revision of the GS–1410 series, retitled *Library-Information Service Management Series,* a new GS–1409 *Bibliographic-Information Analysis Series,* a revision of the GS–1411 series, retitled *Library-Information Service Assistant Series,* and a general guideline called Grade-Level Evaluation Guide for Professional Positions Providing Information Services. The current GS–1412 *Technical Information Specialist Services Series* would be abolished and the positions would be allocated to one of the other series.

Library of Congress management is studying these proposed standards and has requested comments and suggestions from Library of Congress labor organization representatives and other professional groups. These responses will be used in presenting the Library's position to OPM on the impact that the proposed changes in the standards will have on the management of the Library and on all its staff members, particularly those whose positions are allocated in these series.

It is emphasized that these standards are in the draft stage only. In addition to the Library's comments, OPM will take into consideration comments from other Federal agency personnel specialists, managers, labor organizations, and professional associations. Therefore, it is expected that there will be many revisions before final determination is made on these series.

It is the Library's intention that the OPM Standards Division is made fully aware of the possible difficulties in implementing the standards as currently proposed. The staff may be assured that the Library shall insure that its needs and the staff's are fairly represented in any standard which applies to the Library.

Also in This Issue . . .

Open Forum on Network Governance, Ownership and Distribution of Bibliographic Data Is Reported 39–44

Dong-Suk Kang, Barry Snyder Will Perform Works for Violin, Piano in February 5 Concert 38

Poets Audre Lord, Marge Piercy Will Read in February 9 Program 38

Dong-Suk Kang, Barry Snyder Will Perform on February 5

Works by Stravinsky, Schubert, and Saint-Saëns will be performed in a recital by violinist Dong-Suk Kang and pianist Barry Snyder on Friday evening, February 5, in the Coolidge Auditorium. The McKim Fund, established by Mrs. W. Duncan McKim (Leonora Jackson) through a bequest supporting the composition and performance of chamber music for violin and piano, will sponsor the concert.

Dong-Suk Kang first came to the attention of the American public in 1971 when he won the San Francisco Symphony competition and the Merriweather Post Competition in Washington, D.C., at age 16. Following a debut at the Kennedy Center and an appearance with Seiji Ozawa, he went on to win top prizes in many international competitions, including the Montreal, the Carl Flesch in London, and the celebrated Queen Elisabeth Competition in Brussels. He has appeared at Alice Tully Hall in New York City and the 92nd St. YM–YWHA and at the Spoleto Festivals in Italy and in South Carolina. Born in Korea in 1954, Mr. Kang came to the United States in 1967. He studied at the Juilliard School with Ivan Galamian and Sally Thomas and at the Curtis Institute.

Barry Snyder is the pianist in the Eastman Trio and is an associate professor at the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, N.Y. He won three major prizes in the 1966 Van Cliburn International Piano Competition and since then has appeared widely throughout the United States and Europe in solo recital and with the Eastman Trio and other chamber ensembles. His recordings include the "Coronation" Concerto of Mozart with the Rochester Philharmonic as well as the complete music of Schubert for piano and strings with the Eastman Trio.

At their Library concert on February 5, Mr. Kang and Mr. Snyder will perform Stravinsky's *Suite Italienne* (1932), Schubert's Fantasy in C major, D. 934, and the Sonata in D minor, Op. 75 of Saint-Saëns. The concert, which will begin at 8 p.m., will be broadcast live by radio station WETA–FM. It will be made available to stations in other cities by the Public Radio Cooperative, under the auspices of the Katie and Walter Louchheim Fund in the Library of Congress.

Tickets will be distributed at the Patrick Hayes box office at 1330 G St. N.W. (Jordan-Kitt's) on Monday morning, February 1, beginning at 8:30 a.m. Two tickets will be distributed to an individual with a 25-cent service charge on each ticket. Phone orders may be placed by calling 393–4463. Mail orders are not accepted.

Poets Audre Lorde, Marge Piercy Will Read in February 9 Program

Poets Audre Lorde and Marge Piercy will read from their work in the Library's Coolidge Auditorium on Tuesday, February 9. The program, sponsored by the Gertrude Clarke Whittall Poetry and Literature Fund, will begin at 8 p.m. Tickets may be obtained by telephoning the Poetry Office, (202) 287–5394/5.

Audre Lorde is the author of *From a Land Where Other People Live* (1973), *Cables to Rage* (1973), *New York Head Shop and Museum* (1974), *Coal* (1976), and *The Black Unicorn* (1978). Born in New York City, she attended the National University of Mexico; Hunter College, from which she received a bachelor of arts degree in 1959; and Columbia University, where she earned a master's degree in library science in 1961. She has been a librarian in school and public libraries and has served on the faculties of the City University of New York, Herbert H. Lehman College, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Atlanta University, and Tougaloo College.

Marge Piercy was born in Detroit and received the A.B. degree from the University of Michigan in 1957 and a master of arts degree from Northwestern University in 1958. She has written seven novels. The most recent, *Braided Lives*, will be published on February 10. A play, *The Last White Class*, was published in 1980. Her books of poetry are *Breaking Camp* (1968), *Hard Loving* (1969), *To Be of Use* (1973), *Living in the Open* (1976), *The Twelve-Spoked Wheel Flashing* (1978), and *The Moon Is Always Female* (1980).

The *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* is issued weekly by the Library of Congress and distributed free of charge to publicly supported libraries and research institutions, academic libraries, learned societies, and allied organizations in the United States.

Comparable institutions and organizations in other countries may arrange to receive the *Bulletin* on the exchange basis by applying in writing to the Library's Exchange and Gift Division. All other correspondence should be addressed to the LC *Information Bulletin*, Information Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

APPENDIX

Network Advisory Committee Open Meeting

June 28, 1981

At its open meeting on June 28, the Network Advisory Committee concluded that, on the issue of a proposed governance structure for a nationwide network, the evolutionary approach was the one favored and that on ownership and distribution of bibliographic data, the problems require continuing attention, and the analysis should be expanded to new areas such as full text and personal computing.

This session was the second one held in conjunction with conferences of the American Library Association; the first was held on February 3, 1981, during the Midwinter Meeting. These open meetings were cosponsored by the Multitype Library Cooperation Section of ALA's Association of Specialized and Cooperative Agencies.

Henriette D. Avram, director for processing systems, networks and automation planning, Library of Congress, and chair of the Network Advisory Committee (NAC), opened this session by saying that these public meetings have provided the advisory committee with the opportunity to share with the library and information science profession its exploration into two important issues: governance for a nationwide network and ownership and distribution of bibliographic data. As background, Mrs. Avram described past NAC activities and some of the events that have influenced its present position vis-a-vis complex networking problems.

The issues being discussed are the result of two earlier program sessions of the Network Advisory Committee. Two papers entitled *A Nationwide Network: Development, Governance, Support* and *Ownership and Distribution of Bibliographic Data* were given wide distribution before this program to provide a summary of the advisory committee's approach to these issues (see the LC *Information Bulletin* for May 29, 1981, pp. 174–5). Both papers are available on request from the Cataloging Distribution Service, Customer Services Section, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20541.

Mrs. Avram then turned the program over to Ward Shaw, executive director of the Colorado Alliance for Research Libraries and representative of the American Society for Information Science on the advisory committee, who served as moderator. The first issue discussed was the topic of nationwide network governance.

Alphonse Trezza, director of the Intergovernmental Library Cooperative Project, Library of Congress, described the background and problems associated with network governance. Networking itself received prominence with the publication of a program document, *Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action,* by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) in 1975. Several years of discussion and debate followed, and the October 1980 NAC meeting led to the preparation of *A Nationwide Network: Development, Governance, Support,* which presented three scenarios for consideration: evolutionary, private sector, and legislative. The advisory committee did not recommend a single approach but did formulate several questions to assist the audience in reviewing this issue (again, reported in the May 29 issue of the LC *Information Bulletin,* p. 175).

Three panelists addressed the issue of governance: Barbara Markuson, executive director, Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority; Susan Martin, librarian, Johns Hopkins University Library; and William DeJohn, director, Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center.

Mrs. Markuson said that from her point of view, as director of a state network looking at how networks are operating at present, her organization has contracts or contacts with a number of entities and organizations, ranging from OCLC to the state library to equipment vendors and suppliers. The problem with the models presented in the paper was that it was difficult to conceive of a governance structure that could embrace such a diverse set of agencies or organizations.

In addition, she said, our thinking has been constrained by the level of networking achieved, such as networks for interlibrary loan or bibliographic control. In recent years, and noticeably at the ALA Annual Conference last summer, an entirely new dimension of networking has appeared with the advent of personal computers. Users unconnected to libraries could begin accessing bibliographic data bases and could conceivably form "networks" of their own. Different models from those proposed may be needed, and Mrs. Markuson expressed concern that none of the existing models may be flexible enough to take into account such diversity. She also questioned whether a central group would be wise enough to comprehend the evolutionary process taking place at the grass roots.

The second panelist, Susan Martin, stated that while the profession may be facing the same problems and have the same concerns as it did in the

mid-1970s when the NCLIS program document was approved, the solutions to these problems may be different now because we have to operate within a different political climate. Also in the mid-1970s, there was little knowledge of or experience with technology and its impact on library operations. Libraries have had decades of experience with cooperative efforts, which at an earlier time could be much more informal and less structured. As technological aspects of cooperation or networking become more pervasive, more rules may have to be imposed as well as a more structured governance mechanism.

Mrs. Martin concluded by saying that the forum structure of the Network Advisory Committee is extremely important. An evolutionary or free marketplace approach toward the development of a nationwide network must include the diverse forces in our society, and NAC, whose members reflect this diversity, should play a leading role in bringing these different parties together.

The last panelist, William DeJohn, began with his reactions to the scenarios presented in the discussion paper, giving his order of ranking for importance. The evolutionary scenario is taking place now, and from the standpoint of his organization and the individual librarians he is working with, this particular approach would seem to be appropriate because the focus is from the bottom, and the upper layers of bureaucracy are added as needed.

With regard to the private sector scenario, Mr. DeJohn said that funds from consortia (to run the network) should be obtained from state and multistate organizations as well as from libraries and library cooperatives. The network should not overlook state funds for projects because each state does have the responsibility to obtain services for its citizens outside the state borders as well as within state borders.

Mr. DeJohn did not think that the legislative scenario looked very promising, given the present political climate. If one of the first two scenarios did not work, we might be left with the legislative approach, but this did not appear to be very stable.

The model proposed in the legislative scenario was that of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). The fact that CPB has been in existence for several years and is now suffering budget cuts is one consideration. Attempting to put into place such an organization at this time would be a large problem. If, however, such an organization were funded, there probably would not be any problem with the governance structure presented in the discussion paper, assuming that the entire profession could agree that this was the model to work toward.

Another point to consider, he said, is that the NCLIS program document was developed several years ago, and perhaps it would be appropriate to redefine, reexamine, and reendorse the NCLIS program of action. Particularly if one looked back at the areas of responsibilities outlined in the original document, what would be the roles or responsibilities at the Federal, multistate, state, and local levels today? In this context, Mr. DeJohn said that he was operating a multistate network that is involved in getting information and materials for library users. Thus far, the information or materials that must be obtained from other libraries throughout the country can be accessed or tapped without too much difficulty. It is not certain what a national network could do that is not being done now.

Following the panelists' presentations, the discussion took the form of a dialogue between the audience and the panelists and among the panelists themselves and is summarized below.

Questions were directed to Mrs. Markuson about her statements on a "user network" and the diversity of components that make an acceptable governance structure difficult to achieve. Mrs. Markuson explained that the networks operated by the bibliographic utilities (such as OCLC, Research Libraries Information Network, University of Toronto Library Automation Systems, or Washington Library Network) are more properly described as librarians' networks since they exist to assist with the task of running libraries. In the future, one may see linkages with or among personal computers and development of networks among users of such systems whose data are not necessarily used to support library activities. Such networks raise different sets of problems in working out services and determining the kinds of information needed by the users.

The discussion paper talked about the evolutionary process in terms of linking the bibliographic utilities when, in fact, we could be talking about linking online catalogs, cable television, and so on. The governance structure adopted would depend on what is being linked, and there is greater variety among the institutions or organizations than what was originally thought.

A question was raised about the relationship of governance to the introduction of legislation (H.R. 8395) to establish an Institute for Policy on Information. Mr. Trezza felt that since the Federal Government's commitments to libraries were real, the community should have a voice in determining how those funds should be spent. Another approach would be to refuse all Federal funding for libraries and expect to obtain everything from local, regional, or state levels.

Mrs. Markuson added that there were three critical problems facing libraries in their attempts to reach

STAFF NEWS

Library staff and their families enjoyed the annual carol sing in the Great Hall on Wednesday, December 23. Performers included the WRA Choral Society and Copyright Chorale (left) and soloist Alfred E. McEwen, coordinator, Equal Employment Opportunity Compliance Office (top left photograph). Also joining in the event were (center left photograph) Deputy Librarian William J. Welsh, Librarian Daniel J. Boorstin, Mrs. Boorstin, and the Boorstins' son, Paul.

Greetings were offered by The Librarian and by Charles Jackson and Alfredda Payne, 1981 and 1982 WRA presidents, respectively. John Watson directed the WRA Choral Society and Joseph Miranda, the Copyright Chorale. Leo Anderson was master of ceremonies.

Clifford M. Wilson Dies

Clifford M. Wilson, who retired from the Library at the end of 1964 after almost 40 years of service, died on Thursday, November 25, at the Upson County Hospital in Thomaston, Ga. Mr. Wilson had lived in Yatesville, Ga.

Mr. Wilson came to the Library as a stack assistant shortly after graduation from high school in Clinton, La., in 1922. Except for a short period at the beginning of his service, he spent his entire career in the Congressional Reading Room. In 1942, he became assistant custodian and, in 1949, was named chief of the Congressional Reading Room, the position from which he retired.

Mr. Wilson's survivors include his wife, of the home. Funeral services were held on November 28 in Forsyth, Ga., with burial following in Monroe Memorial Gardens.

Ruth Evans Retires from Copyright

Copyright Office deposits and acquisitions librarian Ruth Evans retired last fall after 24 years of service at the Library of Congress. Ms. Evans, who earned a 35-year Federal Service Award in May 1981, served in the Copyright Office during the terms of five Registers of Copyrights.

"The use of computers in the search process has made my job more efficient—that is probably the biggest change I have seen during my years here," Ms. Evans said. An important contribution of Ms. Evans was her special responsibility for the acquisition of Hebraic materials for the Library's Asian Division.

Joseph Brooks Earns 30-Year Pin

On December 11, Glen A. Zimmerman, Associate Librarian for Management, presented Joseph F. Brooks with a 30-year Federal Service Award pin. Present at the ceremony to honor Mr. Brooks were Gerald Garvey, chief, and John Laffey, assistant chief, Buildings Management Division, and Clinoth Colbert, William McColl, Clyde McPhatter (who heads the Building Services Section), and Charlie Wallington, all of the same division.

All of Mr. Brooks' Federal career has been at the Library, where he was appointed a laborer in October 1951. In 1953, Mr. Brooks transferred to the Central Services Division as a motor vehicle operator. He returned to the Buildings Management Division in February 1972 as a janitor foreman. Mr. Brooks was promoted to his present position of laborer foreman in September 1974.

Mr. Brooks and Mr. Zimmerman

Staff Activities

Michael W. Albin, field director of the Library of Congress Office in Cairo, Egypt, is the author of "Napoleon's *Description de l' Egypte:* Problems of Corporate Authorship" in *Publishing History* (Vol. 8, 1980).

Casimir Petraitis, of the Language Services Section, CRS Office of Assignment, Reference, and Special Services, recently returned from India, where he attended two seminars, one on "Forests and the Environment" on December 2–3 in Bangalore, and the other on "Forests, the Environment and People in the Third World" on December 19–20 in Egmore. Dr. Petraitis also gave a lecture entitled "Tropical Deforestation and Recent Efforts by the United Nations and the United States to Alleviate it since the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment in Stockholm" at five centers—Loyola College in Madras, St. Aloysius College in Mangalore, Kerala Forestry Institute in Peechi, Madurai Kamaraj University in Madurai, and before the Afforestation Committee in Auroville.

Assistant Register of Copyrights **Anthony "Pat" Harrison** discussed copyright issues at the Second Film and Television Archival Cataloging Documentation Conference held in Washington, D.C., in November. Sponsored by the American Film Insti-

tute, the conference brought together archivists from Britain, Canada, and the United States. Mr. Harrison discussed progress made toward a five-year review of photocopying practices, fair-use guidelines, and the new off-air videotaping guidelines recently developed for educators. He also participated in a question-and-answer session about other copyright concerns.

Michael Keplinger, chief of the Information and Reference Division, spoke on "Developments in Copyright" at a meeting of the Chicago Bar Association in December. During a morning session, he led a discussion and later was a member of an afternoon panel which discussed copyright cases decided in the past year.

David Leibowitz, senior attorney-adviser in the Copyright Office, delivered the opening remarks at a meeting of the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D.C., on October 19. Main speaker for the event was Jack Valenti, director of the Motion Picture Association of America, who spoke on "The Chutzpah of Cable Television." Mr. Leibowitz also participated in a seminar held by the Broadcasting Education Association on November 7. The topic set for the seminar was "Copyright Problem Areas: New Directions."

Copyright and communications were the subjects of two speeches delivered recently by Copyright Office senior attorney **Patrice Lyons.** At a NASA Science and Technical Information Conference held in Washington, D.C., on October 22, she spoke on "Current Developments in Copyright." On December 4, Ms. Lyons discussed "Legalities of New Technologies" and held a group session at the annual session of the Council of Communications Society in Crystal City, Va.

John A. Wolter, chief, Geography and Map Division, presented a series of lectures in the upper Midwest during October. On October 19, he was distinguished visiting scholar at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, where he presented two illustrated lectures: "The Library of Congress Geography and Map Divison" to geography department and library school faculty and students and "A Treasure of Maps" to a general university and public audience. Mr. Wolter also presented an illustrated lecture on the comparative plates in atlases at a meeting of the Chicago Map Society held in the Newberry Library on October 20.

On October 21, he addressed faculty, students, and library staff members at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. His subject was the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division. On the evening of October 22, Mr. Wolter presented an illustrated lecture on "The Official Charts of the Great Lakes" to an audience of representatives from several organizations and institutions, benefactors of the American Geographical Society Collection and the university, and members of the faculty and staff at a banquet held in honor of the silver anniversary of the university and the formal opening of the AGS Collection. The American Geographical Society Collection, one of the world's great geographical libraries, is housed in new quarters in the university's Golda Meir Library.

The **American Red Cross Bloodmobile** will visit the Library on Wednesday, February 24, and Thursday, February 25, from 8:30 a.m. to 2:15 p.m. each day. The unit will be located in the sixth floor Madison Building Assembly Room, LM 649. Staff members wishing to donate blood should register with keyworkers in their respective divisions. Donors are requested to use the regular shuttle bus service.

Personnel Changes

Appointments: Andrea DeCoteau, special police officer (private), SP–7, Bldgs, 10335; William Houston, special police officer (private), SP–7, Bldgs, 10335; Delinda Lee, clerk-typist, GS–3, Bldgs, 10520; Kay Ritchie, assistant editor, Near East National Union List, GT–9, Afr/ME, 10483; Gary Smith, clerk, GT–3, Photodup, M106D; Kathy Tezla, research analyst (foreign language), GS–7, FRD, 403; Diane Williams, clerical assistant, GT–3, Photodup, M109C.

Temporary Appointments: Denise Abrams, deck attendant, GS–3, Col Mgmt, G113K; John Bussey, foreign affairs analyst, GS–5, CRS F, NP; David Gandle, deck attendant, GS–3, Col Mgmt, G113L; Virginia Howard, foreign affairs analyst, GS–5, CRS F, NP; Alexander Mask, deck attendant, GS–3, Col Mgmt, G113L; Bradley Roberts, foreign affairs analyst, GS–5, CRS F, NP; Robert Vockel, foreign affairs analyst, GS–5, CRS F, NP.

Reappointments: Garry Gray, reading room assistant (trainee), GS–4, GRR, 10506; Jane O'Callaghan, supervisor, Processing Unit, GS–6, CRS L, 10514.

Temporary Reappointments: Maja Felaco, pictorial library technician, GS–5, P&P, NP; Jeffrey

Osborne, reference assistant, GS–5, CRS E, NP; Cecil Muriel, clerk/messenger, GS–3, CRS C, NP; Veronica Reilly, assistant secretary, GS–5, P&P, NP; Catherine Rivers, deposit recorder, GS–5, Cop Acq & Proc, NP.

Promotions: Linda Bartley, to CONSER operations coordinator, GS–14, Ser Rec, 10546; Barbara Boone, to supervisor, Catalog Maintenance Unit, GS–9, Cat Publ, 10502; James Gilreath, GRR, to American history specialist, GS–13, Rare Bk, 10481; Claudia Ruoff, Preserv, to microform processing assistant (trainee), GS–6, GRR, 10509; Kenneth Simpson, Bldgs, to processing assistant, GS–5, Ord, 10526; Theresa Sullivan-Flynn, to microform processing assistant (trainee), GS–6, GRR, 10509.

Transfers: Ardith Bausenbach, Cop Cat, to entry editor, GS–9, Ser Rec, 10495; Philip George, Ser, to microform processing assistant (trainee), GS–6, GRR, 10509; David Hsu, E&G, to preliminary cataloger, GS–5, Desc Cat, 10431; John Wayne, Cop Inf & Ref, to copyright examiner, GS–11, Cop Exam, NP.

Resignations: John Barr, FRD, Nancy Canfield, CRS AIS; Gerald Carter, Photodup; Kenneth Cobb, FMO; Mary Lyons, Photodup; Brenda Mack, LL AB; Cathy Middleton, FRD; David Parker, ASO; William O'Regan, Cop Inf & Ref; John Stocker, CRS F; Prudence Wise, Ser Rec.

the next level of networking: where to get the massive infusion of capital to provide the services needed at present and in the future; how to bring smaller libraries into the network and make them more responsive to all parts of society; and how to build a national system when the parts comprising the system are under local ownership. Although she agreed with Mr. Trezza on the need for a national program, she thought that "governance" may not be the right term for what is needed. The profession wants to know how it will be represented, how will it operate in the library of the future, or how will it get the funding needed to support improved library and information services. Perhaps funding is the key issue instead of governance.

Mr. Shaw discussed the difference between governance and government. A series of contracts is not a governance structure and has no relationship to government in that no laws and legislation are involved. Imposing a governance structure on a government model may mean that some loss of control over what we want to do is inevitable but perhaps for the common good. How can the common good be determined under such circumstances, and who will determine the common good?

Additional questions were raised by the audience on the difference between governance and regulation and the applicability of the model of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to library problems where strong initiatives, great flexibility, and a measure of free enterprise are required. Mr. Trezza reiterated the point that what NCLIS envisioned was a policymaking and coordinating body, not one concerned with management or regulatory matters. Such a body would be influenced by two groups, the public or the users and the practitioners, in terms of what was needed and what priorities should be placed on the projects. It would also centralize library concerns within one agency rather than among different agencies as is now the case.

Mr. Trezza added that the availability of Federal funds has a "trickle down" effect in that they create a reserve of state and local funds. Activities funded with local funds have a "bump up" effect, he said. At some point these two processes will merge, and the profession would want to have a say in how this merger takes place rather than letting it happen accidentally.

A member of the audience commented that the evolutionary process would probably not merge accidentally because its path would be determined by what people need and how they acquire services. Because failures in government programs are more prevalent than successes, the evolutionary process would be more desirable.

Mr. Shaw mentioned that Federal funds available for networking activities constitute a very small percentage of the total. Federal funds are valuable in that they provide seed money for research that might not be done otherwise, but is the small amount involved worth the trouble?

Another comment made indicated the need for a continuous forum whereby the diverse segments of the profession can meet to articulate and express their opinions on the different issues. A continuing assessment of library and information service needs in the national scene is necessary as well as having these needs directed toward different funding sources.

Mr. Trezza added that the success of library funding in the future will be determined by the degree in which the library community is united, can get support from the nonlibrary community, and can prove that library and information services are a national priority. There is a need to find better ways of coordinating funding for national library programs.

The OCLC Users Council provided a written statement on this issue, favoring the evolutionary process.

In concluding remarks, Mrs. Markuson said that one should probably avoid words like "governance" or "networks" because they will always be controversial. Instead one should talk about "money," "planning," and "development," particularly within a framework for improvement of library services. There might be far more agreement and consensus with such an approach.

Mrs. Martin commented that the discussions of governance have tended to favor the evolutionary approach. Mr. Trezza's point, however, is a valid one in that if the library community does not do something positive, something could be imposed on us from above. She suggested that what might be useful is to concentrate on parts of national or nationwide cooperation and networking. A broader cut across the profession, the private sector, or the information industry may be unrealistic and perhaps threatening. The point made earlier about the necessity for having a continuing assessment of needs in the library and information communities is also pertinent.

Mr. DeJohn's concluding statements indicated that the Network Advisory Committee might find it more fruitful to emphasize planning and development of networking activities in the United States rather than governance and a nationwide network. The advisory committee provides a forum where one can discuss, argue, or articulate ideas on complex networking issues, and as a panelist at this meeting and a participant in its other open meetings, he appreciated the fact that NAC has provided the profession with an opportunity to listen to and share ideas from diverse interests.

In closing the first part of the program, Mr. Trezza said that the Network Advisory Committee is interested in receiving comments from the profession on this issue or others it might consider in the future. Because its membership represents diverse interests, it can take on the role of an informal advisory group to the profession and concentrate on those areas that are critical for everyone.

For the issue of ownership and distribution of bibliographic data, Richard Dougherty, director, University of Michigan Libraries, began by describing the background and the events that led to the compilation of the paper *Ownership and Distribution of Bibliographic Data,* the result of an NAC program meeting. Several problems precipitated this discussion, and these have been articulated in the form of questions presented by the advisory committee (see the May 29 issue of the LC *Information Bulletin,* p. 175).

Although the program meeting did not resolve all of these issues, it did clarify and sharpen them. Mr. Dougherty said that, for himself, the discussion of ownership and distribution of bibliographic data was illuminating and worthwhile. He had always thought of ownership in terms of books rather than in terms of bibliographic records.

There is, he said, a relationship between an individual bibliographic record and the data base in which it resides. One may be more interested in controlling access to the aggregate of records in the data base rather than to individual records. An analogy can be made to the battles over water rights in American history where access to the water, not the water itself, was the bone of contention. In this light, the person or agency that controls access to the aggregate of bibliographic records in a data base is more important than the person or agency that controls bibliographic data.

Following Mr. Dougherty, three panelists presented their views on this issue: Lee Handley, executive director, Southeastern Library Network; Sandra Paul, SKP Associates, who represents the Association of American Publishers on NAC; and Edward Shaw, president, Research Libraries Group.

Mr. Handley began by reading the statement provided by the OCLC Users Council (of which he is a member), whose 78 delegates represent 2,500 libraries that use OCLC services:

> The issue of ownership of bibliographic records was fairly well defused by the statement of OCLC's Board of Trustees in 1980 February. Until such time as a legal precedent is set, the various parties are involved in uneasy peace. The concept of joint ownership and lack of restrictions in the OCLC statement provide an environment necessitating no small degree of mutual trust. In general, the notion that there might be proprietary rights for any truly public information network has been rejected by users of such systems.

Mr. Handley echoed these thoughts by saying, "If it isn't broken, don't fix it." About a year ago, the profession thought there was a potential problem that was precipitated by concerns expressed by OCLC over uses others might make of the OCLC data base. OCLC felt that safeguards and attendant restrictions would be needed to protect the collective interests of all concerned. The question now is whether the danger is real or imagined, and if the danger is real, who poses the danger?

Five potential parties might pose a threat: an individual library, small groups of cooperating libraries, large groups of cooperating libraries, not-for-profit competitors, and for-profit competitors. The first three have access to the bibliographic records in the data base and have in their possession some subset of the total data base. They, however, would be unlikely to pose any danger to OCLC. The fourth and fifth parties want to acquire the data and compete and, therefore, pose a possible danger. Mr. Handley felt that the most dangerous of these would be the large groups of cooperating libraries because they already have ready access to and possession of the bibliographic data in question. It is highly unlikely, however, that these groups would sponsor an activity that would pose a true threat or real competition unless OCLC changed its position drastically, resulting in wide-scale dissatisfaction among its members. The large groups of cooperating libraries might then have to find an alternative to an unsatisfactory situation. He noted that at present, it appears as if the necessary checks and balances are working.

Ms. Paul, the next panelist, said that after years of antagonism between librarians and publishers on issues like copyright, it was interesting for her to attend the Network Advisory Committee program meeting and to hear the positive tone of the discussion. In particular, the following statement from the discussion paper was pertinent.

> Possession of bibliographic records may not constitute ownership in a legal sense. Access to such records, therefore, may require a new concept of access or control other than ownership to replace or supplement the traditional practice of copyright. For bibliographic records, ownership may be better established by the possession of and the ability to provide access to records. Such access could be governed by contractual arrangements.

Ms. Paul added that this statement was included in a report she wrote for the newsletters of the Association of American Publishers and the American Association of University Presses.

Ms. Paul continued by saying that the discussion of ownership has been extended from bibliographic records to abstracts and indexes, with the problem of full text looming on the horizon. The profession will have to resolve the problem of providing incentives to the creators to keep them creating in an environment where the text is in machine-readable form and where someone other than the traditional publisher is providing the text.

The last panelist, Mr. Shaw, noted that this discussion and the earlier one on governance had a common thread in that both are complicated and unclear. One thing, however, that is clear is that someone pays for the cost of creating, maintaining, and distributing bibliographic data, from the student at a private institution paying tuition to the user (also a taxpayer) paying to access a commercial data base or utility. The question is not who pays, because somehow costs will be borne, but who is to be subsidized? Purchasers of MARC tapes are subsidized by the Federal Government (in the form of appropriations from Congress to the Library of Congress) in that their subscriptions represent only a small fraction of the total cost of creating machine-readable records.

Mr. Shaw said that he was not opposed to subsidy, but one should recognize that the library and information communities are subsidized because their direct and indirect contributions to society are deemed worthy of support. Subsidies, however, can also be revoked, an act that can be justified because of changes in the priorities of our society. Mr. Shaw said that as a university officer, he would be opposed to a downward shift in priorities, but as a taxpayer, he would agree that some of these shifts were necessary.

Within this framework, the OCLC third-party-use policy requires some additional background on the message it is really conveying. First, it implies that nonprofit organizations are a special club. Although they are willing to support each other through exchanges or other means, once the data move into the for-profit sectors, the nonprofit organizations wish to place restrictions and controls on their use. Second, it says that nonprofit organizations are subsidized and do not pay their own way. Thus, they have to seek any additional sources of support to bolster their economic well-being. What is not stated is that nonprofit organizations cannot accrue assets for distribution to private parties and do not have access to investment incentives available to the for-profit sector. Restrictions or controls on bibliographic data are necessary when dealing with the for-profit sector because these are the only means available to support the nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Shaw described the approach on data ownership taken by the Research Libraries Group (RLG) since September 1979. Each member owns its own data and may do what it wants with no restrictions, and the partnership as a whole (RLG) owns all the data and may do as it sees fit with no restrictions from individual members. This concept of dual ownership exists irrespective of whether the data were derived from other records or created by individual members. Individual RLG members compile their own criteria for further distribution of their own data, and the criteria may differ from member to member.

Mr. Shaw noted that RLG members have defined the creation of arrangements that are mutually beneficial as one of the principal criteria to govern collective use of the data base. Mutual benefit is a form of payment, which extends the concept of shared cataloging to the interorganizational arena and, thus, is the factor behind RLG's agreements with organizations like the Washington Library Network or the University of Toronto Library Automation Systems.

He added that RLG is not a bibliographic utility and does not wish to become one. Its members, therefore, are not interested in protecting their data but instead wish to see their data available to the nation as a whole and to acquire access to data not created by RLG for their own use. This approach is not necessarily valid for everyone. Bibliographic utilities, because of their economic structure, may have to take a more proprietary posture toward their data, and the for-profit sector must recover costs and see a reasonable return on its investment.

The presentations from the panelists were followed by a discussion of various points raised by the panelists or by the audience. The following section summarizes the major points.

Questions were raised about the differences between RLG and OCLC on third-party use of bibliographic records and the fact that the different policies may have been determined by the relative size of the data bases of the two organizations. Mr. Shaw replied that the policies were not all that different. In practice, RLG's biggest problem has not been in acquiring data but in getting data to libraries desiring them.

Mr. Dougherty, who was speaking as a member of the Research Libraries Group, noted that the motivations for joining RLG have to be considered when talking about the differences in policy. The Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), which provides the computer support for RLG, is a tool to make other things work. For each RLG member library, it was the university, the trustees, the regents, or the president who made the decision to join RLG. They are interested in programs like sharing the burden of collection development, attempting to find mechanisms by which to share expenses for scarce resources,

or collaborating in the area of preservation of collections. In this context, the sharing of bibliographic data is less important.

It was noted that if a research library switched from OCLC to RLG and wanted to have its records, OCLC would allow the transfer. In fact, these libraries would most likely already have possession of their records. It was mentioned that several RLG libraries in the PALINET area (a regional network organization operating in Philadelphia, Pa.) did not want to cut their ties with the network and proposed loading their bibliographic records, which had been created on the RLIN system, into OCLC. The PALINET board supported this proposal and took it to OCLC, which in turn has not made a decision yet on how this transfer could be effected but is willing to do this.

Mr. Handley was asked about the problem, which has since disappeared, that he alluded to in his presentation. He said that about a year before, there was a possibility of establishing an independent shared cataloging network in the Southeast, using, as a base, the archival records obtained from OCLC and, thus, displacing OCLC services in the Southeast. The question could be raised as to what extent could a regional network be able to pursue its own path without concern for the collective interests of all the members of OCLC. And to what extent does OCLC have a responsibility, as an organization funded by operating revenues, to take steps to safeguard its financial integrity?

Although OCLC initially proposed safeguards, which amounted to restrictions, the net result of the controversy was positive because the library community objected to that first approach, and it was modified. No restrictions were placed on what an individual library may do, but if there were a competitive threat, such as from the commercial sector, OCLC would deal with it on a one-to-one basis.

In responding to a question about personal computers and their users gaining access to an information network, Mr. Shaw said that the problem was not a trivial one. The popularization of computer technology will undoubtedly change the way networks or utilities operate in the future. In a university environment, he did not envision ownership to be a problem when faculty and students were able to access the network through own computers but felt that contractual provisions would be needed to prevent entrepreneurs from reselling the data. He mentioned that the RLG board has given its highest priority in the next 24 months to investigating the issue of distributive computing or processing, including microcomputing, in the hands of faculty and students.

A comment from a member of the audience indicated that while the library community should be encouraging the transmission of information for any purpose, it should also recognize that this must be done in such a way that creators, distributors, and others are adequately rewarded or these agencies might fail. A clearinghouse mechanism is needed to monitor the reuse of bibliographic records and to reward the creators.

The three panelists provided some concluding remarks. Mr. Handley said that the issue of ownership of bibliographic data is part of the larger issue of governance, the economic infrastructure, and the suprastructure of network organizations that were discussed during the first half of the program. The evolutionary process appears to be working, and since this process has been responsive to the changing needs of libraries, it is to be preferred to global solutions inflicted from the top down.

Ms. Paul noted that although the problems associated with ownership of bibliographic data may have essentially been resolved at this meeting, the library and information communities are just beginning to look into the problems associated with electronic publishing, personal computers, and so on. Mr. Shaw said that as we proceed down the evolutionary path, we sould be clear about what we are saying and what we are not saying with regard to ownership.

[*Lenore S. Maruyama*]

ISSN 0041–7904 *Key title:* Library of Congress information bulletin